DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 689 EA 020 981

AUTHOR Murphy, Joseph
TITLE The Reform of School Administration: Pressures and Calls for Change. Final Copy.
PUB DATE Dec 88
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Administrator Selection; *Change Strategies; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; *Principals; *Public Education; *School Administration; *Superintendents

ABSTRACT

This paper is part of a larger report entitled "The Reform of American Public Education in the 1980s; Themes and Cases." A discussion on the reform of school administration, specifically the forces leading to the reform of school administration in the 1980s is presented. The first part of the report documents the forces that led to demands for improvements in preparation and functioning of principals and superintendents. The pressures are considered contextual or macrolevel influences on the reform of school administration. Next, the microlevel pressures are analyzed. The need for reform is based on analyses of problems with the ways principals and superintendents are recruited, trained, certified, and selected. The discussion is drawn from two sources that include the critical analyses of educational administration and reform reports of diverse types. Appended are 110 references. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306689

The Reform of School Administration: Pressures and Calls for Change

Joseph Murphy
Vanderbilt University

American Educational Research Association
San Francisco March 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph Murphy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL COPY
December 1988

EA 020 981

For inclusion in The Reform of American Public Education in the 1980s: Themes and Cases, J. Murphy (Ed.). McCutchan, forthcoming.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> I am thoroughly and completely convinced that, unless a radical reform movement gets underway--and is successful--most of us in this room will live to see the end of educational administration as a profession. (Griffith, 1988, p. 1)

> Visions for improving student learning have found life in the policies advocated by governors and adopted by state legislatures, but these same leaders share my conviction that any reform strategy failing to recognize the need for new, sustained leadership in the schools will not endure. (Clinton, 1987, p. 3)

Although decision makers at all levels of government were slow to turn their attention to the reform of school administration (National Governors' Association, 1987; Nunnery, 1982; Peterson & Finn, 1985), it was inconceivable that issues of leadership and management could long be ignored as the educational reform movement of the 1980s continued to gather speed and for momentum. Problems in programs for the preparation of aspiring administrators and for the training of those already employed were simply too obvious to be overlooked. Questions about the proper role of management in a reformed educational system were too critical to be left on the back burner. Issues of leadership and vision were becoming too enmeshed in the larger management environment in which schools operate to pass over administrators of schools. A deep, if not widely practiced, self-examination of the gains made in the practice of educational administration since the adoption of the social science paradigm was too thoroughly underway and too critical of our progress to allow school administration to continue unaltered on its current course. And lurking behind all of the pressures for change was the growing belief that a reform movement that did not address issues of management and leadership was unlikely to have a lasting impact.

In this chapter we examine the reform of school management in the 1980s. Because reform initiatives in administration have lagged behind changes in other areas--curriculum, testing, teacher preparation--we know

less about the effects of these efforts than we would like. However, we can thoroughly document the forces that have led to demands for improvements in the preparation and functioning of principals and superintendents and we can chart how states have begun to respond to these pressures. In the first part of the chapter we provide this documentation. The pressures we consider in this section can be viewed as contextual or macro-level influences on the reform of school administration. Next we turn to an analysis of micro-level pressures. These are endemic to the process of recruiting, preparing, and placing principals and superintendents. Our discussion in this section is drawn from two sources--critical analyses of educational administration and reform reports of diverse types. In the next chapter we examine state-initiated responses to calls for the reform of school management. We cull information from secondary sources and look directly at activity in one state, Ilinois. We also review some issues concerning the topic of school administration reform that deserve further attention.

Pressures for Reforming School Administration: Macro-Level Issues[1]

In a latter section we present difficulties with preparation programs in educational administration. Here we are more concerned with the larger environment surrounding school management and how it has contributed to demands for improvements in the profession. We review six of the influences below.

Reemergence of the School Administrator as a Key to School/District Improvement

> In study after study, it has been shown that one key determinant of excellence in public schooling is the leadership of the individual school principal. (Educational Commission of the States, 1983, p. 29)

For much of the last quarter century, a general belief in the professional impotence of administrators has prevailed. The picture of the

school superintendent or principal as the beleaguered professional who can exercise little influence over his or her organization, and who is only distally connected to important educational processes and outcomes, has been widely accepted in educational administration circles. The development of this mindset coincided with a number of events that caused education in general to experience a tailspin (Campbell, 1981). In addition, the frameworks and models used to describe educational administrators within organizations, especially open systems and political decision-making models, have contributed to the emerging characterization of school administrators as little more than caretakers.

Three conditions are currently unfolding, however, which show that principals and superintendents can exert considerable influence over their schools and districts. First, there is a growing understanding that the very real conditions in schools captured by open systems and political decision-making theories render the administrator's job difficult, but not impossible. A general feeling of resignation is being replaced by analyses of ways in which administrators can work more effectively within the reality of schools as complex organizations.

In addition, the dark cloud that has hung over education in general in the recent past is gradually dispersing. Education is once again at the forefront of the public agenda. Increases are being observed in highly visible measures of school outcomes, such as SAT scores. There has been a leveling off and even a small turnabout in the decline of public confidence in schools. The devastating effects caused by declining student enrollments have largely played out in most places. Schools have a stronger sense of direction and a more unified purpose than they have had for some time. In a similar vein, some of the unrealistic expectations with which schools have been saddled have been somewhat tempered. There is a growing sense of confidence in the technology of schools, a belief that we are better able to

implement factors that will result in student learning outcomes. Anguish over the breakup of the educational coalition has been replaced with the knowledge that pluralistic bargaining actually works fairly well in the service of education's broader goals. And finally, the upheaval caused by the onslaught of collective bargaining has receded somewhat as the catastrophic predictions of widespread teacher-administrator hostility and rampant loss of administrator influence have failed to materialize.

An array of information is also emerging that shows more directly that school administrators are generally a key factor in change and improvement in schools and districts. Support for this position is derived from five related literature sources: school change; school improvement; staff development; administrator as instructional leader; and school effectiveness and district effectiveness (see Murphy, forthcoming, for a review). Common to all this literature is a sense of the power of the administrator to be a significant force for improvement in organizational conditions and processes and student outcomes.

An Emerging Belief that New Models of School Organization, Governance, and Management are Needed

> Efforts to improve the performance of schools without changing the way they are organized or the controls they respond to will therefore probably meet with no more than modest success; they are even more likely to be undone. (Chubb, 1988, p. 29)

The incompatability of the traditional bureaucratic model of organization and governance of schools with the type of educational systems many scholars believe will be needed in the future is a central tenet of recent reform reports (Boyer, 1983; Carnegie, 1986, 1988; Green, 1987; Holmes, 1986; Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, & Cusick, 1986; see also Frymier, 1987). Reformers have turned their attention to the development of models of school organizations that offer more potential for school improvement than do bureaucracies. Most of these newer perspectives share common

characteristics. One of these is decentralization of authority to the site level (Goodlad, 1984; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration [NCEEA], 1987; National Governors' Association, 1986). Recent attention in the literature to topics like site-based management and shared governance (see Caldwell & Spinks, 1988; Duttweiler & Hord, 1987) reflects this theme. A second important aspect of these newer models is a restructuring of the roles and functions of teachers and principals (see Carnegie, 1986; Clark, 1987). Discussions of team approaches to school management (Glatthorn & Newberg, 1984; Lieberman, 1988), self-managing teams (Hackman, 1986; Manz & Sims, 1987), and lead teachers (Carnegie, 1986; Goodlad, 1984) address this issue. New views about appropriate bases of administrative authority comprise a third component of organizational models being developed to shed the yoke of bureaucratic constraints (Angus, 1988; Kearnes, 1988). In these emerging perspectives, administrators rely less on formal authority and control mechanisms and more on expertise (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], 1988). They manage as stewards rather than as autocrats. They empower professionals rather than control employees. Buttressing these new views of organizational governance, control, and management in schools are descriptions of leadership in successful non-educational settings (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982) and trends toward the evolution of business organizations that encompass decentralization, new forms of leadership, and empowerment (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986; Kearnes, 1988).

Embedded in these newer forms of organization are views about the role of management that are quite different than those emphasized in many university departments of school administration. As Rossmiller (1986, p. 3) reminds us, as these newer principles take hold in schools, there are clear implications for "the way we prepare administrators, [and] the focus we give

programs." Not only will new skills need to be emphasized in preparation programs, but considerable attention will need to be devoted to the underlying fabric--the values, beliefs, and assumptions--to which school administrators are exposed (NCEEA, 1987).

The Growing Realization that Administrators Are Often Inept Managers of Technical Core Operations

> The technical tasks associated with producing student learning are not supervised, managed, or coordinated in any serious sense across managerial levels in school districts. Hannaway & Sproull, 1978-79, p. 4)

Campbell (1981, p. 7) has noted that "the sub-areas of curriculum and instruction have particular significance for educational administration since administration is, after all, designed to enhance teaching and learning." However, most training programs provide little exposure to these critical areas. Miklos (1983), Boyan (1981), and Culbertson (1981) describe how, over the last quarter century, preparation programs have come to be dominated by the social sciences. Khleif (1979) presents a particularly cogent example of how one elite training program for superintendents socializes prospective administrators away from educational issues and concerns for students and toward management and organizational issues. Sergiovanni and his colleagues (1987) and Marshall and Greenfield (1987) show how these socialization pressures actually de-skill principals in curricular and instructional areas. Although some scholars (e.g. Erickson, 1977) have suggested refocusing theory on issues of curriculum and instruction in administrative preparation programs, their calls have generally gone unheeded. After analyzing the content of superintendent training programs, Champagne and his colleagues (1984) reached the following conclusions:

> Our investigation indicates that the training of our most powerful educational leaders, our superintendents, is directed mainly to concerns other than those of the learning of students. In fact, a great many superintendent

> training programs appear to exclude <u>any</u> indepth study of curriculum, instruction or supervision. (p. 14)
>
> Thus we are saying that principals do not study any of these areas in any depth either. (p. 16)

Gerritz and his colleagues (1984) concluded that a major problem with university training programs, according to California school administrators, is their failure to provide skills in the technical areas of observation and evaluation of classroom behavior. Sarthory (1974), Snyder and Johnson (1985), and Peterson and Finn (1985) reached similar conclusions.

Research at every level of educational management consistently uncovers administrators who believe they should devote more time to instructional issues (Casey, 1980; McLeary & Thompson, 1979; Willower & Fraser, 1980). Yet the instructional management role is one that most administrators perform neither well nor often. Studies at the district office level have determined that superintendents neither spend much time on curricular and instructional matters at the central office nor coordinate and monitor these areas at the school level (Duignan, 1980; Hannaway & Sproull, 1978-79; Willower & Fraser, 1980). Investigations of the principalship at both the secondary (Blank, 1986; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; California State Department of Education, 1984; Little & Bird, 1984; Martin & Willower, 1981; Willis, 1980) and elementary (Howell, 1981; Morris, Crowson, Porter-Gehrie, & Hurwitz, 1984; Peterson, 1978-79) levels also find that instructionally informed administrators are a rare commodity. As we have reported elsewhere:

> Taken together, these studies present a picture of administrators whose time is heavily devoted to matters other than curriculum and instruction, to issues of student discipline, parent relations, plant operations and school finance. Most principals do not formally supervise and evaluate teachers, plan and coordinate curriculum, actively monitor the technology of the school or the progress of students, or spend much time in classrooms. In short, most principals do not act as instructional leaders. Rather, in most districts and schools, curriculum and instruction are managed by default. (Murphy, forthcoming)

This judgment is not surprising given the lack of consideration accorded to technical core issues in formal administrative training programs and inservice activities (Aplin & Daresh, 1984; Champagne, et al., 1984; Daresh & LaPlant, 1984; Gousha, Jones, & LoPresti, 1986; Kowalski, 1986; Pellicer, 1982). Absence of instructional leadership is often attributed to the multiple demands and time pressures inherent in administrative roles. While this is clearly a contributing factor, an even more powerful explanation is the lack of knowledge on the part of administrators about how to manage technical core operations. As our understanding of the correlation between active instructional management and student learning has grown (see Murphy, forthcoming, for a review), so has pressure to change training content to provide superintendents and principals with the technical skills needed to successfully manage curriculum and instruction in their districts and schools.

Growing Disenchantment with the Theory Movement

> Some might say it [the behavioral science theory engine] was yanked off front and center stage because it did not yield descriptions, explanations, and predictions that were judged sufficiently useful to warrant its continuance as the driving force in the study of educational administration. (Carver, 1988, p. 1)

One of the major forces contributing to calls for reform in educational administration is an increasing disillusionment with the theory movement and the social science frameworks that have shaped preparation programs over the last 30 years (Boyan, 1981; Campbell, 1981; Cooper & Boyd, 1987; McPherson & Crowson, 1987). Elsewhere we have observed that:

> Trying to adequately grasp the role of the school principal with reference solely to normative theories and models is like turning on one's high beams to see more clearly in the fog; the area of illumination is increased, yet clarity of vision is reduced. (Murphy, 1986, p. 126)

Culbertson (1981, p. 41) made the same point when he observed that the

"mission, stance, and approaches of the theory movement, have offered insufficient guides for the study of educational administration."

While it is beyond the scope of this chapter to develop all the critiques that have been leveled against the theory movement, and it is important to remember that behavioral science theory has made important contributions to educational administration (Willower, 1987), we will discuss three problems identified by these analyses that are contributing heavily to the demands for the reform of school administration. All three concern the practical applications of the theory movement. First of all, Campbell (1981, p. 13) has declared that "educational phenomena have served the disciplines instead of the disciplines being brought to bear upon educational problems." Translating theory into strategies to improve schools is a difficult enough enterprise when serious attempts to do so are undertaken. In the absence of such efforts, theory is likely to be of little use to school personnel.

Second, there is an inherent assumption in the theory movement that scholars adept at developing models and frameworks are also skilled in translating them into practice and that universities can effectively develop bridges between research and practice. Mann (1975) and Campbell (1981) have both commented on the inaccuracy of this assumption. As a consequence, theory has often remained untranslated and has provided little guidance to administrators in the day-to-day operation of schools (Goldhammer, 1963; Griffiths, 1988).

Third, the theory perspective has failed to adhere to its own core ideas and subsequently has become, to some extent, a movement conducted more for its own sake than for improving schools. Culbertson (1981) identifies the four core ideas of the theory movement as: research originating from and guided by theory; reliance on social and behavioral science concepts and methods of investigation; almost exclusive reliance on hypothetico-deductive

systems; and an emphasis on description of practice rather than prescriptions for administrative behavior. It is our position that the theory movement has become tarnished because it is perceived to have only marginal practical value to school personnel. However, unlike some, we do not believe that this is due primarily to emphasis on theory or reliance on the social sciences. Rather, the general disillusionment with the usefulness of the theory movement stems from over-emphasis on the hypothetico-deductive approach and the concomitant failure to stress inductive approaches and to use qualitative lenses to examine organizational phenomena. As a result, the "upward seepage of empirical juice" (Culbertson, 1981, p. 34) that was expected to refine theory to the conditions of the workplace has failed to materialize. In time, the theory movement has begun to look less and less descriptive and more and more normative (see Morris et al., 1984). The theory movement's failure to adhere to its own philosophical underpining of "reality checking" has caused it to be viewed by many practitioners as worse than useless. This perceived lack of usefulness and inability to accurately describe organizational conditions have contributed to the demands for the reform of school administration, especially of preparation programs.

Increasing Disgruntlement with the Prevailing University Training Model

> The attempt by professional educators to develop a pseudo arts and science degree has been met with scorn in most universities. (Griffiths, 1988, p. 18)

> Evidence suggest[s] that the training-and-certification sequence leaves something to be desired. Survey after survey of practicing school administrators reveals that most judge their university training to have been easy, boring, and only intermittently useful to them in their work. (Peterson & Finn, 1985, p. 49)

It is not surprising that a model of training which promulgates ideas often judged to be impractical and unconnected to the realities of the workplace, that neglects to provide guidance in managing

technical core operations, and that often fosters the perception of professional impotence should be subject to demands for reform. Daresh and LaPlant (1984) reviewed the university training model for adherence to the principles of quality staff development and found numerous deficiencies. In their judgment,

> University courses are excellent ways for participants to earn degrees, satisty scholarly curiosity, or meet state certification requirements, but as long-term solutions to the need for more effective administrator inservice, they are limited. (p. 5)

In addition, both Mann (1975) and Bridges (1977) have written provocative essays in which they describe how the processes and procedures stressed in university programs are often diametrically opposed to conditions that characterize the workplace milieu of schools (see Peterson & Finn, 1985, for a review). For example, as Bridges (1977) has observed, while within the school context a premium is placed on verbal skills, the ability to make quick decisions, and activeness, we train our students to be passive, to use rational decision-making models, and to develop their written skills to the near exclusion of oral ones. Practitioners have become disillusioned by the failure of university programs to ground training procedures in the realities of the workplace and by their reluctance to treat content viewed as useful by administrators. This disenchantment, in turn, is partially fueling the demand for changes in methods of preparing school administrators (Nunnery, 1982).

Growing Perception of Little Improvement in Administrative Practice

> The organizational changes in schools that had been generated by the old paradigm had extremely disappointing results. (Reynolds, 1988, p. 7)

There is an emerging belief that, for a number of reasons, including those noted above, all of the labors of the past 30 years have produced few real improvements in administrative practice and school organization. After

. . . his review of the research on school administration between 1967 and 1980, Bridges (1982) reported that

> The research seemed to have little or no practical utility. In short, there is no compelling evidence to suggest that a major theoretical issue or practical problem relating to school administrators has been resolved by those toiling in the intellectual vineyards since 1967. (p. 25)

Blumberg (1984), in his essay on school administration as a craft, goes even further. He states:

> My bets are that one cannot point to a single administrative practice that has been influenced in any significant degree by research on the behavior of administrators. (p. 27)

While these critiques might be viewed as disenchantment with the theory movement or with university training programs, we note them separately because they reflect a more global dissatisfaction with the status quo in educational administration. They not only reflect the new era of turmoil (Griffiths, 1979), but supply grist to demands for the reform of educational administration in general, and of administrative training programs in particular.

Calls for Reform: Problems With the Preparation of School Administrators

> There is then, pressure either to get rid of administrators as we now know them, or to take people untarnished by departments of educational administration. While this is the rumbling, the criticisms of present-day administrators and their preparation are loud and clear and the demand for reform is heard on all sides. While some of the criticism is overstated, and certainly all does not apply to everyone, I find the central thrust to be accurate, and, in fact, to coincide with what so many in the profession have been saying in private for years. (Griffiths, 1988, p. 8)

Calls for the reform of school administration are based primarily on analyses of problems with the ways principals and superintendents are recruited into preparation programs, trained once they are there, and certified and selected for positions once they complete coursework. There is a widespread belief that preparation programs lack coherence, rigor, and

standards and that administrators are ill-prepared to effectively assume their duties once they leave these programs. Reformers in the 1980s tend to approach administrators from one of two distinct perspectives (Slater, 1988). One group tends to see principals and superintendents as "the problem" (e.g. Chubb, 1988) and, therefore, as a target of reform, and they propose reform strategies to neutralize or eliminate their influence (e.g. Holmes, 1986). A second group maintains that educational administrators are an important cog in the reform machine and that lasting educational improvement is unlikely to occur without their commitment, assistance, and leadership (NCEEA, 1987; National Governors' Association, 1986).

In the remainder of this section, we analyze the messages conveyed by both of these groups, and thereby develop a fairly comprehensive picture of the problems in the area of school administration. In compiling this review, we relied upon a cross section of influential reform reports and studies as well as reviews and critiques from the general literature. We attempted to extend the information presented in the thoughtful analyses that have already been undertaken in this area (e.g. Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984; Griffiths, 1988; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Peterson & Finn, 1985; Pitner, 1982).

Recruitment and Selection

> The lack of sound recruitment programs may be the most serious problem of all. (AACTE, 1983, p. 12)
>
> We are aggressively non-selective. It is as if we felt that all teachers have an inalienable right to study to become administrators, akin to our support of a free, open, public elementary and secondary school. (Clark, 1988, p. 3)

Analysts of the recruitment and selection processes used by educational administration programs have generally found them to be wanting (Gerritz, Koppich & Guthrie, 1984). Procedures are often informal, haphazard, and casual (Clark, 1988; Goodlad, 1984). Prospective administrators are often self-selected and there are few leader recruitment programs (Achilles, 1984;

self-selected and there are few leader recruitment programs (Achilles, 1984; AACTE, 1988; NCEAA, 1987). Standards for admission are often conspicuous by their absence (Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984), and, not surprisingly, the quality of applicants is quite low (Rossmiller, 1986). For example, Griffiths (1988, p. 12) reported that "of the 94 intended majors listed in [the] Guide to the Use of the Graduate Record Examination Program 1985-86... educational administration is fourth from the bottom"; only students entering the fields of physical education, social work, and home economics scored lower. Many prospective administrators are not only of low ability, but tend also to be politically conservative and adverse to risk-taking (Achilles, 1984). Finally, there is ample evidence that the current procedures have not produced the quantity of minority administrators needed to lead our racially diverse schools (Griffiths, 1988; NCEEA, 1987).

Calls for reform in the area of recruitment usually begin with recommendations that standards for admission be raised (Educational Commission of the States, 1983). The institutionalization of district programs, sometimes in cooperation with universities, to identify employees with leadership potential and to provide incentives for them to enter preparation programs has also been suggested (AACTE, 1988; Goodlad, 1984; NCEEA, 1987). It has also been proposed that programs be established specifically for the recruitment of minorities and women (NCEEA, 1987). In conjunction with this equity objective, some reform reports have called for the creation of fellowship programs to be funded by the federal government (NCEEA, 1987). Other reports have drawn attention to the need to establish fellowships for the general pool of potential recruits to preparation programs.

Training Content

> Moreover, the knowledge and skills needed to become an effective educational leader and school manager are generally not those provided by current Administrative

> Service Credential Programs. (Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984, p. 1)
>
> In fact, they [Gross and Herriott] found a negative correlation between number of courses taken in Educational Administration and their indicators of success. (Erlandson, 1979, p. 151)

There are a number of significant problems with the knowledge base undergirding programs in educational administration. To begin with, most programs do not provide job candidates with a good general education. Within these programs "course content is frequently banal and outdated" (Clark, 1988, p. 5). There is a profound lack of agreement about what the content of preparation programs should be (Griffiths, 1988) and a pervasive unwillingness to act as if such information were useful (Goldhammer, 1983). "Preparation programs are essentially diverse collections of formal courses that, taken together, do not reveal consistent purposes or a systematic design" (NASSP, 1985, p. 2; see also Achilles, 1984; Peterson & Finn, 1985). There is a general absence of a "continuum of knowledge and skills that become more sophisticated as one progresses" (Peterson & Finn, 1985, pp. 51 & 52; see also Pitner, 1982).

One of the most serious problems with the knowledge base in educational administration preparation programs is that it does not reflect the realities of the workplace (March, 1978; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; NASSP, 1985; Nunnery, 1982; Pitner, 1982). The problem, as Griffiths (1988, p. 19) correctly concluded, is that the theory and research that we have borrowed from the social sciences have "never evolved into a unique knowledge base informing the practice of school administration" (see also Culbertson, 1981; Goldhammer, 1963). There appears to be a need for better methods to get at what Carver (1988, p. 1) labeled the central issue in the study of educational administration--"our ability to understand practice." Most initial efforts in this direction are moving us toward the development of a professional and clinical knowledge base similar to that emphasized in other

professions such as law and medicine (see especially the work of Silver 1986, 1987). In order to more fully develop a professional knowledge base for educational administration, there must be a change in focus from deductive to inductive research strategies and increased attention must be devoted to grounded theories and ecologically valid research (AACTE, 1988; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987). The development of much needed collaborative relationships between schools and universities may be a potential by-product of utilizing a professional knowledge base in preparation programs (Griffiths, 1988).

In addition to reflecting more appropriately the world of practice, the new content of training programs must address a number of other important problems. To begin with, despite some very well-reasoned pleas (see especially Erickson, 1979), remarkably little content in preparation programs is based on administrator effects on organizational outcomes. Boyd and Immegart (cited in Boyan, 1981) elegantly laid out the solution path for this problem when they reported that

> The task before us, then, is to redirect research and practice in educational administration toward a primary (but obviously not exclusive) concern for student outcomes. (p. 11)

We have already reported that most administrative programs do not provide prospective administrators with the foundation that they need in the areas of curriculum and instruction. Yet, it is clear that technological acumen often distinguishes more effective from less effective principals and superintendents (see Murphy, forthcoming; Murphy & Hallinger, 1986)--"leadership in high-performance schools is more pedagogical and less managerial than in low-performance ones" (Chubb, 1988, p. 33). In order to offset this defeciency in the current knowledge base, the new package of content in preparation programs must be more student-oriented and should be more focused on issues of curriculum and instruction. A more logical and

. . . appropriate knowledge base will also need to be based more upon the principles of effective change and school improvement. A number of authors have pointed out that newly-minted administrators are poorly prepared to successfully promote change in their organizations, "especially at the level of practical decisions" (Fullan & Newton, 1986, p. 11; see also Greenfield, Marshall, & Reed, 1986; Hall & Rutherford, 1983).

While important problems may accompany an over-emphasis on skill-based instruction, the pervasive anti-recipe philosophy that characterizes many programs of educational administration has resulted in significant gaps in the prevailing knowledge base (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987), an almost complete absence of performance-based program components (NASSP, 1985), and a truncated conception of expertise (see Kennedy, 1987). Administrators consistently report that the best way to improve training in preparation programs is to improve instruction of job-related skills (Erlandson & Witters-Churchill, 1988; Notar, 1988-89; Weindling & Earley, 1987). Griffiths (1988; see also Erlandson, 1979) has chronicled the costs that accompany this knowledge gap in our training programs and our consistent unwillingness to address the problem:

> Probably more school administrators fail because of poor skills than any other single reason, yet program and faculty in educational administration fail to do anything about it. It's as though a baseball team in spring training gave the player books to read and lectures on the theory of baseball and did not have the player practice hitting and fielding. Administrators have to perform, and in order to perform well they must have the basic skills of administration. (p. 17)

The solution consists of greater attention to the development of practical skills (in a variety of different formats) in administrative preparation programs (Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984; Weindling & Earley, 1987).

Finally, it is clear that the newer paradigms of school organization and governance reviewed earlier--site-based management, shared governance, self-managing teams--hold implications for the knowledge base in educational

administration programs (AACTE, 1988). As the NCEEA (1987, p. 5) has concluded, school-based models of governance lead to "awesome and exciting differences... in the responsibilities of school administrators and in the skills they would need." Analyses of these new responsibilities and skills must be made and the information gained thereby should be integrated into program content.

The Delivery System

> The program should be conceived in the framework of the professional school model, not the arts and science model, meaning that the program should prepare students to act, not merely think about administration. Clinical training should be stressed, without neglecting the intellectual aspects of preparation. (Griffiths, 1988, p. 14)

The current arts and science model used to provide training of administrators has neither furnished professors with the status for which they had hoped (Griffiths, 1988) nor provided graduates with the tools they need in order to be successful practitioners (Peterson & Finn, 1985). In addition, it has driven a wedge between professors and practitioners, creating what Goldhammer (1983, p. 265) has labeled the "university-field gap." For these reasons, it has become clear to many professors and administrators that a fundamental change in the basic delivery system employed in preparation programs is required. A consensus seems to be emerging about the need for a professional model of preparation--a program that is clearly separate from the Ph.D. training sequence and that focuses on the problems of practice and on the clinical aspects of the administrator's role (AACTE, 1988; NCEEA, 1987).

Not only has the basic delivery system been subject to severe criticism, but considerable problems have also been uncovered with the training processes employed within preparation programs. Specifically, methods of delivery are incongruent with the conditions administrators face on the job. Thus, both program content and the procedures used to convey it

are de-coupled from the realities of the workplace. In our earlier review of the works of Mann (1975) and Bridges (1977), we reviewed some of the most startling discrepancies between the methods employed in the training of administrators and those that they need to use on the job. It is clear that fundamental changes in the delivery model will need to be accompanied by significant shifts in delivery procedures if the worlds of the university classroom and the school are to be bridged effectively.

A professionally-based delivery system offers hope of addressing another problem with current preparation programs--the lack of shared responsibilities between universities and schools (Griffiths, 1988). In a particularly insightful essay, Carver (1988, p. 6) pointed out that "the absence of any meaningful coupling between the training arm and the employing agents" is the point in the fabric of educational administration where the threads are the weakest. Delivery procedures that help create bridging mechanisms and allow the various partners to do what each does best are much needed. The work of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1985) in the area of performance-based preparation is particularly instructive on this point.

Finally, it is important that the format of any delivery system reflect commitment on the part of the students and provide them with richer opportunities to become socialized to their chosen profession than is now the case. Current programs have drifted far afield from the traditional residency model; as many as 95% of all students are now part-timers (Griffiths, 1988), and "many students complete their training...without forming a professional relationship with a professor or student colleague" (Clark, 1988, p. 5). There is a need for a delivery system in which students go through their program as a cohort and which makes "administrator preparation full-time academic and clinical work" (Griffiths, 1988, p. 21).

Instructional Approaches

> Overall quality of teaching in educational administration training programs should be improved. A good deal of what occurs in these programs is labeled as teaching soley because it involves an instructor and students. Little of it is of quality. (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987, p. 256)

It is probably not surprising, although it is disheartening, that inappropriate content ineffectively packaged should also be poorly delivered in many preparation programs. Next to the general absence of effective teaching techniques, the most serious problem is the lack of variety of approaches used to provide instruction (AACTE, 1988; Nunnery, 1982). For example, in the Texas NASSP study (Erlandson & Witters-Churchill, 1988), principals reported "lecture and discussion" to be the primary instructional mode used for eight of nine skill areas examined--and it was a close second for the ninth skill, written communication! In communicating the appropriate knowledge base, greater emphasis should be placed on reality-oriented instructional situations and materials (AACTE, 1988; Hoyle, 1987; Miklos, 1983), recent technological advances (Griffiths, 1988), models of instruction employed in other professional schools (NASSP, 1985), and experiential learning methods (Weindling & Earley, 1987). In addition, preparation programs need to ground instructional approaches more heavily on the principles of adult learning (AACTE, 1988; Levine, Barth, & Haskins, 1987; Pitner, 1987).

The clinical aspects of most preparation programs in educational administration are notoriously weak. Despite an entrenched belief that supervised practice "could be the most critical phase of the administrator's preparation" (Griffiths, 1988, p. 17) and a long history of efforts to make field-based learning an integral part of preparation programs (see Daresh, 1987, for a review), little progress has been made in this area. The field-based component continues to be plagued by problems: (1) inadequate attention to clinical experiences; (2) activities arranged on the basis of

convenience; (3) poor planning, supervision, and follow-up; (4) absence of integration between classroom and field-based experiences; and (5) over-emphasis on low-level (orientation type) activities (Clark, 1988; Erlandson, 1979; Peterson & Finn, 1985).

Clinical experiences need to: (1) become a more important component of each student's program; (2) be well-planned and carefully supervised; (3) begin early and be spread across the entire preparation program; (4) be based on a series of planned experiences rather than designed to fit around the student's job; (5) involve significantly more contact with and observation of practicing administrators; (6) be more fully integrated with other graduate coursework; (7) be arranged in a "continuing interactive two-way process of action learning" (Hughes, 1987, p. 138); (8) allow students to work together in learning teams; and (9) rely much more heavily upon practicing school administrators in the planning, implementation, and evaluation phases (AACTE, 1988; Clark, 1988; Daresh, 1987; Erlandson, 1979; Hughes, 1987; NASSP, 1985).

Standards of Performance

> Most schools of education are embarrassed by the academic performance of the doctoral students in educational administration. The model grade given to students is an "A"; not because we have criterion referenced performance standards that all could ultimately meet but because we have given up on holding tired, end-of-the-day students to graduate level performance. (Clark, 1988, p. 4)

The lack of rigorous standards is a serious problem that touches almost every aspect of educational administration. Previously, we noted the general absence of standards at the point of entry into preparation programs--"if entrance requirements exist at all, they are not very competitive and most applicants are accepted" (Peterson & Finn, 1985, p. 51; see also Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984). Once students enter preparation programs, the situation does not improve. They are not exposed to rigorous coursework: "Students move through the program without ever

seeing a current research study (other than a local dissertation), without ever having read an article in ASQ or EAQ or AJS. They are functionally illiterate in the basic knowledge of our field" (Clark, 1988, pp. 4-5; see also AACTE, 1988). Because performance criteria are ill-defined, there is also very little monitoring of student progress (Hawley, 1988). Not surprisingly, very few entrants to certification programs fail to complete their programs for academic reasons (Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984). The delivery system most commonly employed--part-time study in the evening or on weekends—contributes to the evolution and acceptance of low standards (Clark, 1988; Hawley, 1988; Mann, 1975). Exit requirements in turn are often "slack and unrelated to the work of the profession" (Peterson & Finn, 1985, p. 54). Compounding the lack of standards at almost every phase of preparation programs are faculty who, because they are only marginally more knowledgeable than the students, are unable or unwilling to improve the situation (Hawley, 1988; McCarthy, 1987). An even greater obstacle to improving standards are the bargains, compromises, and treaties that operate in preparation programs--the exchange of standards for high enrollments and compliant student behavior:

> The solution is often to conclude a treaty of mutual non-agression with one's students. The terms of the treaty are usually that the professor won't plague the students with "irrelevant" ideas if the students will keep quiet about that professorial non-performance. The glue on the agreement is high grades based on low or no performance which is traded for silence. (Mann, 1978, p. 144; see also Cusick, 1983; Oakes, 1985, Page, 1984; Powell, Farrar & Cohen, 1985; Sedlak, et al., 1986; and Sizer, 1984 for descriptions of these compromises between teachers and students at the elementary and secondary levels)

Peterson and Finn (1985) have concluded that the time has come for a marked elevation of standards in school administration. We discuss potential avenues for raising standards throughout this part of our review and analyze specific actions states have taken along these lines in the next chapter.

> But whether few or many, these requirements are nearly always stated in terms of paper credentials supplied by colleges of education--transcripts and credit hours that must parallel those on a list maintained by the certification bureau or the state education department. License-seekers rarely have to pass any sort of test or examination analogous to a bar exam or to medicine's "national boards," nor does the education profession enforce any substantial standards for those seeking administrative certification. (Peterson & Finn, 1985, p. 144)

Suggestions for the reform of educational administration extend beyond preparation programs to address problems with the certification and employment of principals and superintendents. The major criticisms of certification/accreditation processes are that they: are unduely costly and cumbersome (Goodlad, 1984); focus on requirements and skills different from those that administrators need to be successful on the job (Clinton, 1987); reduce the pool of potential leaders to applicants who have worked in public schools (Bennett, 1986); operate at only one period of time, i.e., at the completion of preparation programs (NCEEA, 1987); and, in total, do not promote excellence in the profession (NCEEA, 1987).

Advocates for reform have proposed a number of solutions for these problems. Perhaps the most controversial are those that establish alternative routes to certification, thus allowing prospective administrators to maneuver around educational administration programs altogether. Such proposals are designed "to encourage service in the public schools by qualified persons from business, industry, the scientific and technical communities and institutions of higher learning" (Educational Commission of the States 1983, p. 39; see also Clinton, 1987; Bennett, 1986). Other proposals call for bringing greater coherence to the licensing process by eliminating the piecemeal methods by which certification can be gained (Peterson & Finn, 1988) and by establishing a tighter coupling between certification requirements and the skills prospective administrators

need in order to be effective (National Governors' Association, 1986). A few influential reports have suggested the use of multiple levels of licensure. For example, the National Governors' Association (Clinton, 1987) and the NCEEA (1987) both have called for provisional or entry-level certification of new administrators to be followed by full certification after the documentation of successful performance. Coupled with these suggestions are proposals for re-certification every few years "on the basis of successful performance and continuing professional development" (NCEEA, 1987, p. 27). At least one report has been farsighted enough to draw the connection between licensure and successful performance on a post-training examination (Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie, 1984).

Employment

> How a principal gets a job is strikingly quixotic. Most principals are judged by a set of local and custom-bound criteria that may be as cloudy as anything existing in the contemporary job market. (Boyer, 1983, p. 221)
>
> In particular these individual experiences illuminate a central finding about common practices in principal selection: the process itself cannot be characterized as merit-based or equity-centered. (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983, p. 19)

The first major problem in the area of employment deals with the processes used to select new administrators. Although "remarkably little is known about just how these critical educational leaders are chosen" (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983, p. 1), tentative evidence suggests that selection procedures are quixotic (Boyer, 1983), random (Achilles, 1984), and chance-ridden (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983). There is little evidence that educational leadership is either demanded of or sought in candidates. In general, there is a lack of criterial specificity that

> opens the way for widespread reliance on localistic notions of 'fit' or 'image' which emerged as centrally important. ... However, time and time again, this 'fit' seemed to rest on interpersonal perceptions of a candidate's physical presence, projection of a certain self confidence and assertiveness, and embodiment of

community values and methods of operation. (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983, p. 7)

The most clearly developed proposal for reform in this area has been articulated by Baltzell and Dentler (1983, pp. 42-44). They suggest, among other things, the use of more highly focused selection criteria with better linkage to merit standards, a layered screening process, greater reliance on data and less on interpersonal judgments, and more direct attention to equity issues. On this last matter of equity, Clark (1988, p. 8) has examined the role that departments of educational administration have played in the selection process and has found that they "are part of the problem not the solution in increasing the placement of women and minority groups in positions of educational leadership." He suggests renewed attention to equity issues in colleges of education. Finally, relevant reform reports consistently recommend that selection criteria be more heavily weighted in favor of educational leadership skills (Clinton, 1987).

A second important employment topic that has been targeted for reform is the changing nature of authority in schools. Criticisms of the status quo in this area come from two separate but related sources--discussions of the supposed failure of bureaucratic school structures (Frymier, 1987; Holmes, 1986; Seglak, et al., 1986; Sizer, 1984) and re-analyses of the proper distribution of influence across levels in professional organizations such as schools (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Kearnes, 1988). Both groups of critics generally conclude that there is insufficient authority at the site level for the principal, and teachers, to effectively manage the school. Calls for change follow one of two avenues. The majority of the reformers see the need for additional authority for principals, especially in the areas of finance and personnel (Adler, 1982; Kearnes, 1988). Many proponents of change argue for the devolution of authority to the school as a unit--"a genuine decentralization of authority and responsibility to the local school" (Goodlad, 1984, p. 275)--to the principal plus the teachers

and parents (Boyer, 1983; Sizer, 1984; National Governors' Association, 1986).

A final employment problem noted in recent reform reports is the lack of post-employment training opportunities for principals and superintendents. Three facets of the problem have been revealed. To begin with, there is a virtual absence of induction programs for newly-appointed administrators (Peterson & Finn, 1985). Neither are experiences in the assistant principalship being deliberately structured to nuture administrators for the principalship (Weindling & Early, 1987); if anything, the experience may be providing dysfunctional training (Greenfield, Marshall, & Reed, 1986). In addition, the pool of continued professional growth opportunities for administrators is limited and these experiences often accumulate in an unsystematic manner (Daresh & LaPlant, 1984; NCEEA, 1987). Reform proposals have called for increased attention to ongoing professional development for administrators. Mentorships and enhanced peer interactions are often emphasized in these proposals (United States Department of Education, 1987). The content foci are both educational and managerial skills and the preferred delivery structures are networks and centers outside of the control of colleges of education and educational administration faculty (Boyer, 1983; Educational Commission of the States, 1983).

Summary

In this chapter we discussed the forces leading to the reform of school administration in the 1980s. We noted that the stakeholders at the state level have been slow to turn their attention to the topic of school management. However, the problems in the area of administration are too severe and the consequences of the failure to address them too important to allow issues of leadership and management to be ignored for long. A growing

. . set of pressures for change have begun to build in the environment surrounding the governance, organization, and control of schools. These in turn have been reinforced by problems uncovered in almost every aspect of school administration--from recruitment of prospective administrators to the continued professional development of those already on the job. In the next chapter, we examine actions undertaken by states in response to the escalating demands for the reform of school administration.

Note

1. Based on material from Approaches to Administrative Training in Education, Joseph Murphy and Philip Hallinger, editors, pp. 247-253, State University of New York Press, 1987 and included by permission of the publisher. c 1987 State University of New York. All rights reserved.

References

Achilles, C. M. (1984, Fall). Forecast: Stormy weather ahead in educational administration. Issues in Education, 2(2), 127-135.

Adler, M. J. (1982). The Paideia proposal. New York: McMillan.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1988). School leadership preparation: A preface for action. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Angus, L. (1988, April). School leadership and educational reform. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Aplin, N. O., & Daresh, J. C. (1984, Winter). The superintendent as an educational leader. Planning and Changing, 15(4), 209-218.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1986, September). School reform policy: A call for reason. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Baltzell, D. C., & Dentler, R. A. (1983, January). Selecting American school principals: A sourcebook for educators. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education/National Institute of Education.

Bennett, W. J. (1986). First lessons: A report on elementary education in America. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

Blank, R. K. (1986, April). Principal leadership in urban high schools: Analysis of variation in leadership characteristics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Blumberg, A. (1984, Fall). The craft of school administration and some other rambling thoughts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(4), 24-40.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyan, N. J. (1981, February). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. Educational Research, 10(2), 6-13, 21.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Bridges, E. M. (1977). The nature of leadership. In L. L. Cunningham, W. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Bridges, E. M. (1982, Summer). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-1980. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 12-33.

Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (1988). The self-managing school. New York: Falmer Press.

California State Department of Education (1984, January). California high school curriculum study: Paths through high school. Sacramento: Author.

Campbell, R. F. (1981, Winter). The professorship in educational administration: A personal view. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(1), 124.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986, May). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Author.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1988). Report card on school reform: The teachers speak. Princeton, N.J.: Author.

Carver, F. D. (1988, June). The evaluation of the study of educational administration. Paper presented at the EAAA Allerton House Conference, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Casey, H. (1980). Managerial behavior of principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Champagne, D. W., Morgan, J. L., Rawlings, M. B. R., & Swany, D. (1984, April). Analysis of the content of training programs for chief school administrators in the areas of instructional methodology, curriculum, and instructional supervision. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Chubb, J. E. (1988, winter). Why the current wave of school reform will fail. The Public Interest, (90), 28-49.

Clark, D. L. (1987, August). Thinking about leaders and followers: Restructuring the roles of principals and teachers. Paper presented at a conference on Restructuring Schooling for Quality Eduation, Trinity University, San Antonio.

Clark, D. L. (1988). Charge to the study group of the National Policy Board of Educational Administration. Unpublished manuscript.

Clinton, B. (1987, July). Speaking of leadership. Denver: Educational Commission of the States.

Cooper, B. S., & Boyd, W. L. (1987). The evolution of training for school administrators. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Crowson, R. L., & McPherson, R. B. (1987). The legacy of the theory movement: Learning from the new tradition. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Culberton, J. A. (1981, Winter). Antecedents of the theory movement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(1), 25-47.

Cusick, P. (1983). The egalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Daresh, J. C. (1987, February). The practicum in preparing educational administrators: A status report. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Boston.

Daresh, J. C., & LaPlant, J. C. (1984, April). Inservice for school administrators: A status report. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Duignan, P. (1980, July). Administrative behavior of school superintendents: A descriptive study. The Journal of Educational Administration, 18(1), 5-26.

Duttweiler, P., & Hord, S. (1988). Dimensions of effective leadership. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Educational Commission of the States (1983). Action for excellence. Denver: Author.

Erickson, D. A. (1977). An overdue paradigm shift in educational administration, or how can we get that idiot off the freeway? In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades. Berkeley: McCuthan.

Erickson, D. A. (1979, March). Research on educational administration: The state-of-the-art. Educational Researcher, 8, 9-14.

Erlandson, D. A. (1979, Fall). Language, experience, and administrator preparation. Planning and Changing, 10(3), 150-156.

Erlandson, D. A., & Witters-Churchill, L. (1988, March). The Texas NASSP study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Frymier, J. (1987, September). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 9-14.

Fullan, M., & Newton, E. (1986, April). Principals as leaders of instructional change in large high schools: The perspective of external researchers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Gerritz, W., Koppich, J., & Guthrie, J. (1984, November). Preparing California school leaders: An analysis of supply, demand, and training. Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Educators, University of California, Berkeley.

Glatthorn, A. A., & Newberg, N. A. (1984, February). A team approach to instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 60-63.

Goldhammer, K. (1983, Summer). Evolution in the profession. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(3), 249-272.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gousha, R. P., Jones, A. H., & LoPresti, P. L. (1986, March). Where are we and where are we going in school administration preparation in the United States? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Green, J. (1987). The next wave: A synopsis of recent education reform reports. Denver: Educational Commission of the States.

Greenfield, W. B., Marshall, C., & Reed, D. B. (1986, Winter). Experience in the vice-principalship: Preparation for leading schools? The Journal of Educational Administration, 22(1), 107-121.

Griffiths, D. E. (1979, Fall). Intellectual turmoil in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 15(3), 43-65.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration. (Occasional paper: #8312).

Hackman, J. R. (1986). The psychology of self-management in organizations. In M. S. Pallak & R. O. Perloff (Eds.), Psychology and work: Productivity, change, and employment. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Hall, G. E., & Rutherford, W. L. (1983, April). Three change facilitator styles: How principals affect improvement efforts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Hannaway, J., & Sproull, L. S. (1978-79). Who's running the show? Coordination and control in educational organizations. Administrator's Notebook, 27(9), 1-4.

Hawley, W. D. (1988). Universities and improvement of school management. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Holmes Group (1986, April). Tomorrow's Teachers. USA: Author.

Howell, B. (1981, January). Profile of the principalship. Educational Leadership, 38(4), 333-336.

Hoyle, J. (1987). The AASA model for preparing school leaders. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hughes, M. G. (1987). Trends and issues in educational management development in England and Wales. The Journal of Educational Administration, 25(1), 126-142.

Kearnes, D. L. (1988, April 20). A business perspective on American schooling. Education Week.

Kennedy, M. M. (1987). Inexact sciences: Professional education and the development of expertise. In E. Z. Rothkoph (Ed.), Review of Research in Education. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Khleif, B. B. (1979). Professionalization of school superintendents: A sociological study of an elite program. In R. Barnhordt, J. Chilcott, & H. Wolcott (Eds.), Anthropology and educational administration. Tuscon: Impresora Sahuaro.

Kowalski, T. J. (1986, Fall). Barriers to preparing effective principals. Illinois School Research and Development, 23(1), 1-7.

Levine, S. L., Barth, R. S., & Haskins, K. W. (1987). The Harvard principals' center: School leaders as adult learners. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lieberman, A. (1988, May). Teachers and principals: Turf, tension, and new tasks. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9), 648-653.

Little, J. W., & Bird, T. D. (1984, April). Is there instructional leadership in high schools? First findings from a study of secondary school administrators and their influence on teachers' professional norms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Mann, D. (1975, May). What pecularities in educational administration make it difficult to profess: An essay. The Journal of Educational Administration, 13(1), 139-147.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (1987, March). Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 32(1), 106-128.

March, J. G. (1978, February). American public school administration: A short analysis. School Review, 86(2), 217-250.

Marshall, C., & Greenfield, W. (1987, April). The dynamics in the enculturation and the work in the assistant principalship. Urban Education, 22(1), 36-52.

Martin, W. J. & Willower, D. J. (1981, Winter). The managerial behavior of high school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(1), 69-90.

McCarthy, M. M. (1987, Winter). The professoriate in educational administration: Current status and challenges ahead. UCEA Review, 28(2), 2-6.

McLeary, L. E., & Thompson, S. D. (1979). The senior high school principalship, volume III: Summary report. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Miklos, E. (1983, Summer). Evolution in administrator preparation programs. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(3), 153-177.

Morris, V. C., Crowson, R. L., Porter-Gehrie, C., & Hurwitz, E., Jr. (1984). Principals in action: The reality of managing schools. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Murphy, J. (1986, Winter). Essay review of "Principals in action: The reality of managing schools." Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(1), 125-128.

Murphy, J. (forthcoming). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), Recent advances in educational administration, (vol. 1). Grenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1986, Summer). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. Journal of Educational Administration, 24(2), 213-236.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.) (1987). Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1985). Performance-based preparation of principals: A framework for improvement. Reston, VA: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). Leaders for America's schools. University Council for Educational Administration, Tempe, AZ.

National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results: The Governors' 1991 report on education, chairman's summary. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Governors' Association. (1987). The Governors' 1991 report on education--time for results: 1987. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Notar, E. E. (1988-89). What do new principals say about their university training and its relationship to their jobs? National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal, 1(2), 14-18.

Nunnery, M. Y. (1982). Reform of K-12 educational administrator preparation: Some basic questions. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15(2), 44-52.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Page, R. N. (1984, April). Lower-track classes at a college-preparatory high school: A caricature of educational encounters. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Pellicer, L. O. (1982, October). Providing instructional leadership: A principal challenge. NASSP Bulletin, 66(458), 61-70.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row.

Peterson, K. D. (1977-78). The principal's task. Administrator's Notebook, 26(8), 1-4.

Peterson, K. D., & Finn, C. E. (1985, Spring). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. The Public Interest, 79, 42-62.

Pitner, N. J. (1982, February). Training of the school administrator: State of the art. Eugene: Occasional paper from the University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management, College of Education.

Pitner, N. J. (1987). Principles of quality staff development: Lessons for administrative training. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to Administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Reynolds, D. (1988, April/June). British school improvement research: The contribution of qualitative studies. Qualitative Studies in Education, 1(2), 143-154.

Rossmiller, R. A. (1986, Winter). Some contemporary trends and their implications for the preparation of educational administrators. UCEA Review, 27(1), 2-3.

Sarthory, J. A. (1974). Educational renewal: An inclusive process-oriented model of leadership development. In J. A. Sarthory (Ed.), Educational leadership, renewal, and planning. New York: MSS Information Corporation.

Sedlak, M. W., Wheeler, C. W., Pullin, D. C., & Cusick, P. A. (1986). Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sergiovanni, T., Burlingame, M., Combs, F., & Thurston, P. W. (1987). Educational governance and administration, (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Silver, P. F. (1986, Summer). Case records: A reflective practice approach to administrator development. Theory Into Practice, 25(3), 161-167.

Silver, P. F. (1987). In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Slater, R. (1988, March). How does leadership affect teaching and learning? The School Administrator, 45(3), 13-15, 20.

Snyder, K. J., & Johnson, W. L. (1965). Retraining principals for productive school management. Educational Research Quarterly, 9(3), 19-28.

United States Department of Education. (1987). Principal selection guide. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Weindling, D., & Earley, P. (1987, November). The first years of headship--toward better practice. Educational Research, 29(3), 202-212.

Willis, Q. (1980, July). The work activity of school principals: An observational study. The Journal of Educational Administration, 18(1), 27-54.

Willower, D. J. (1987, Winter). Inquiry into educational administration: The last twenty-five years and the next. The Journal of Educational Administration, 25(1), 12-28.

Willower, D. J., & Fraser, H. W. (1980). School superintendents on their work. Administrator's Notebook, 28(5), 1-4.